

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/014,180	11/13/2001	Srinivas Gutta	US 010567	2684	
24737	7590 11/15/2004	,	EXAM	INER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			WONG, LESLIE		
	F MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2167		
			DATE MAN DE ALMANDA		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/014,180	GUTTA ET AL.	
, and only notion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie Wong	2167	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears amination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application () a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper relich places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the second o	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
NOTE:	·		
$3.\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	etion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			•
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a)□ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided bel	o)⊠ will be entered ow or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.			
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10.		•	
	Tike S Wassur Primary Examiner	lery	
·	Primary Examiner	Leslie Wong Patent Examiner, A	Art Unit 2167

Leslie Wong Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/014,180

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Bieganski teaches the limitations as claimed. Applicants argue that the applied prior art does not teach or suggest aggregating or adding distances. Examiner submits that the above arguments have been addressed in the Final Office action dated 01 September 2004.